

Scott Gustin

From: Kelli Brooks <kellibundgard@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 11:32 AM
To: Scott Gustin
Subject: Proposed Solar Project and Open Space Protection

Hi Scott,

I'm getting in touch with you regarding the proposed solar project behind the Appletree Point neighborhood. We spoke briefly about it last spring at a NPA meeting.

The City Council is requiring the developer, Frank von Turkovich to present his proposal to the Conservation Board. This will provide a chance for public input and the ONLY opportunity for the city to review the potential storm water impact.

Our city councilor Dave Hartnett has also recommended that we address the parks commission on this issue. In light of that, I'm hoping you can share the data gathered from the public comments on the interactive map created while the open space protection plan was being revised. I can see on the website that only some of the comments are available for viewing. Of course, I realize the logistical limitations of representing every comment about each area in a comprehensive map on line. However, is it still possible to get the official count of how many people commented on that area and the record of their comments?

Thanks,

Kelli Brooks

Scott Gustin

From: Holly Hauser <hollhaus@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 9:38 AM
To: Scott Gustin
Subject: Re: south forty

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good Morning Scott,
Thank you for your prompt reply.
Actually, I do have other concerns and questions.
How will the energy from the proposed project get transmitted?
Who will for the cost for that infrastructure?
What are the health risks for those of us close by
Will some kind of barrier be erected?
And what about the value of our property?
I wish I could attend the meeting, but I teach that evening.

Thank you so much Scott,
Holly

On Oct 28, 2013, at 8:53 AM, Scott Gustin wrote:

Good morning Holly,

Thank you for your comments. I will include them with the Conservation Board's November 4 meeting packet. There's been substantial buzz about this would-be project, and there will be an informational presentation by the developer at the Conservation Board's November 4 meeting at the Public Work's building (the agenda's not yet finalized, but it will be by Wednesday and will be posted online [here](#)). State law exempts utility projects (like this one) from local zoning review, so no zoning permit will be needed for this project. It will need a permit (Certificate of Public Good) from the VT Public Service Board. All that said, the project will need review under the city's stormwater regulations that are administered by Megan Moir at Public Works. I've asked her to attend the meeting so that she can answer questions that may arise about stormwater impacts and review.

Let me know if you have any questions.
Scott

Scott Gustin, AICP, CFM
Senior Planner
Department of Planning & Zoning
149 Church Street
Burlington, VT 05401
Phone: (802) 865-7189
Fax: (802) 865-7195

From: Holly Hauser [<mailto:hollhaus@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2013 10:09 PM
To: Scott Gustin
Subject: south forty

Hello Scott,

I live in the Strathmore development, just a couple houses from the South Forty. As a conservationist, outdoors enthusiast and homeowner, I have many concerns about the latest plan to clear cut the South Forty for Solar Panels. Although a devoted proponent for alternative energy, I think this plan misses some very important points.

The South Forty is one of the last open spaces around here and so many people enjoy this space year round. My daughter and I walk the trails on the way home from school and it home for a diversity of wildlife.

As a result of the tree cutting several years ago, the run off from the storm water has increased drastically. I have installed a sump pump and am building a drainage system around my house sbecause the yards become rivers. Since we are downstream from run off storm water of South Forty, I fear the consequence of the plan to clear cut.

I hope you will take these points into consideration as well as the inherent value in keeping open space open here in Burlington one of the most livable cities in the United States!

Thank you so much for your time and consideration in this important matter.

Sincerely,
Holly Hauser
123 Nottingham Lane

Scott Gustin

From: Kelli Brooks <kellibundgard@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 12:55 PM
To: Scott Gustin
Subject: Solar Project and Flynn Estate

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Scott,

Thanks again for helping me understand the permitting process for the solar project proposed on the Flynn Estate. We have been waiting for months to see a finalized plan from von Turkovich. Admittedly, that seems a bit foolish, as now we are scrambling to raise awareness and grasp how this permitting process is different. I wish there had been more than two weeks between the City Council resolution and the Conservation Board meeting.

Anyway, I have a few more questions:

How long is each person allowed to speak during the open forum period?

Are we allowed to submit evidence such as photos, maps or Environmental Court findings?

We are distributing a flyer this week to inform neighbors about the upcoming Conservation Board meeting. With your permission I would like to include your contact information for those people who may be unable to attend, but would still like to comment on the proposal. Please let me know if that would work for you. If not, is there another way for people to submit their opinions and concerns?

Thanks,

Kelli Brooks

Scott Gustin

From: Keith Tarr-Whelan <ktw@tarr-whelan.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 10:20 AM
To: Scott Gustin
Subject: South Forty Project

Dear Scott,

I understand that consideration will be given to the South Forty project at a meeting of the Conservation Board on November 4. I cannot be present because of another commitment, although my wife will attend. I live in Apple Tree Point across the road from this proposed project. We love this open space and walk in it frequently.

I have several points that I wish to make:-

1. This project, as I understand, would be the largest single solar project in the state, and although an avid supporter of alternative energy, this project would be smack in the center of a wholly urban area and would abut literally hundreds of houses and condos.
2. It would have serious environmental impacts on the surrounding area and significant runoff and storm water impacts on hundreds of homes.
3. It would necessitate the felling of hundreds of trees on the largest undeveloped tract of land left in the city, again having significant storm and runoff impacts.
4. Part of the proposed area of use is a wetland.
5. Because the project is the largest in the state it would require significant infrastructure implications. The generation levels are such that existing local transmission lines do not have the capacity to take the output. Therefore new transmission lines would have to be built, in turn having major environmental degradation impacts in the middle of a heavily populated area.

If this project is to be built at all in one of the most unsuitable places in Vermont and one that has a direct impact on hundreds of homes, I would suggest that consideration be given to some of the following:-

1. The project be scaled back to a level that has minimal environmental impacts and that does not require any major transmission upgrades. Particularly the building of a new and large transmission line through a densely populated area.
2. A buffer zone of 500 feet be put in place between all existing homes and the project.
3. There be no clear cutting of any heavily forested areas (the idea above will save many trees).
4. The project should not impinge on any designated wetland areas.
5. The owner shall be responsible for the cost and implementation of any water runoff improvements needed to ensure there are no adverse impacts on any of the surrounding housing developments and that this requirement shall remain in place during the projects' lifetime
6. Consideration be given, as has been suggested in other alternative energy projects in Vermont, that the owner be required to take out a bond in order to hold harmless any drop in adjacent property values resulting directly from the impact of this project.
7. The developer is precluded from "flipping" from a solar farm to a housing development – which has been his goal for many years.

I am very pleased that this project has been opened up to public comment and that the board is taking a serious look at the impact it might have in what can only be described as one of the most unlikely and unattractive places for the such a project anywhere in Vermont. Removing literally thousands of trees to have solar is not what conservation is all about.

Thank you for considering my views and points.